

"very potent reform" and went on to observe that "forcing Members to live under the laws they pass may also have a useful, modifying effect on what Congress decides to pass."

Mr. Speaker, all of us, I'm sure, have received—and welcome—thousands of constituent communications imploring us to keep faith with provisions of the Contract With America. Even before this Congress began, one of my constituents, Mel Cellini of Madera, CA, shared with me a copy of his letter to Speaker GINGRICH. Noting Mr. Cellini's statement that there must be a change in the fact that "Congress has exempted itself from mandates imposed on the rest of society," I take pleasure in making the text of his letter a part of my statement of support for our passage of the Congressional Accountability Act.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 4, 1994.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I are approaching 50 years of age. We have been increasingly disillusioned with the operation of the federal government. The future our two children face is of great concern to the two of us. As long as I can remember the federal government has continued to intrude into our lives via control and taxation. The programs have not only been intrusive, but also quite expensive.

Now one child is in college and the other will soon be going to college. Our dismay with the evaporation of the American dream has been discussed in our family. It is hard to relate to the dream since all we hear from the media are the issues of why we need to contribute and do more for those that refuse to help themselves.

Congress has exempted itself from mandates imposed on the rest of society. This must change.

I backed our local Republican candidate with the fervor that this was our last chance. Yes, George Radanovich won. I truly believe this is a new dawn. The opportunity for a refocused government is here. Just Make Sure the Government Is Out of Our Lives and Our Pocketbook.

Please, do not back down on the ten point contract that the Republicans agreed to fulfill in the First 100 days.

Finally, ignore the personal attacks the media is doing to you. We are behind you 'all the way.' I can hardly wait for the 1995 congress to begin.

Again, Congratulations, and thank you.

Sincerely,

MEL CELLINI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend

their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Senate bill, S. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GILLMOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MONETARY CRISIS IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 30 minutes as the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Mexico today is very serious and has a direct effect on the United States. But if the American people are going to be asked to guarantee billions, up to \$40 billion in loans in Mexico, we have a right to demand that Mexico meet certain conditions in return.

The primary question we have got to answer is simply this: How can we address the problem in Mexico in such a way that ensures that working families on both sides of the border are helped and not hurt by this deal? The Mexican system is riddled with deep structural, political, and economic problems. If allowed to continue to go unchecked, these problems will not only continue to hurt Mexican workers, they will also continue to have a direct impact on the jobs and the wages and the living standards of American workers.

The last time Mexico experienced a similar crisis in the early 1980's, they responded by cutting wages in half for Mexican workers. That was their response, even though Mexican manufacturing profits went through the roof.

In effect it created a situation where Mexico had a boom in billionaires. Members heard me right, billionaires, not millionaires. Yet American workers were forced to compete with Mexican workers who were earning 58 cents an hour. We lost over a half million jobs as a result of that policy, 500,000 American jobs. And all indications today are that Mexico is reading from that exact same playbook, even though Mexican wages are already too low. The devaluation of the peso has driven down their purchasing power by another 40 percent. Yet rather than pledging to raise the standard of living, President Zedillo's economic plan calls for a freeze on wages.

At this rate Mexico is never going to be able to afford to buy the products that we make, and of course that has been the great success of America, that we built a middle class with the purchasing power to purchase.

We have got to find a way to export products to Mexico, not just our jobs and our capital. We had a chance to address this problem when we negotiated the NAFTA agreement. We had a chance to tie wages to productivity and give the Mexican workers more power to bargain for better wages, but NAFTA was a missed opportunity to make real reform. I do not think we can afford to miss that opportunity again.

I would suggest that before we ask American taxpayers to send a dime to Mexico, we should insist that Mexico meet five specific conditions. Let me enumerate them for my colleagues this afternoon.

First, we should insist that Mexico agree to tie wages to productivity. Now what do I mean by that?

□ 1230

In the past decade, Mexican workers have not, and I repeat they have not, reaped the rewards of their hard work, and they do work hard. They are very productive workers. Their productivity increased by 64 percent since 1980.

What happened to their wages? Their wages actually dropped by 31 percent. Prior to the devaluation of the peso over the last several weeks, the wage of a Mexican worker was 69 percent—69 percent—of what it was back in 1980. It was not even worth the value of what it was in 1980.

Former President Salinas recognized this problem when he pledged to tie wages to productivity 2 years ago during the negotiations within his own country, and the debate over NAFTA. But that link has not materialized, and we, I think, should insist that it does.

Now, second, we should insist that the Mexican Government extend fundamental rights to the workers that